

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WILLIAM DALE BRAMLETT,)	
#303 512,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-CV-369-ALB
)	[WO]
SHERIFF DONALD VALENZA, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action on May 28, 2019. When he filed suit, Plaintiff was incarcerated at the Houston County Jail in Dothan, Alabama. On May 31, 2019, the court entered an order of procedure directing Defendants to file an answer and special report. Doc. 4. The order also directed Plaintiff to “immediately inform the court and Defendants or Defendants’ counsel of record of any change in his address,” and cautioned him that “[f]ailure to provide a correct address to this court within ten (10) days following any change of address will result in the dismissal of this action.” *Id.* at 3, ¶8.

On October 8, 2019, Plaintiff’s copy of an order entered October 1, 2019, was returned to the court marked as undeliverable because Plaintiff is no longer housed at the last service address he provided. Accordingly, the court entered an order on October 10, 2019, requiring that by October 21, 2019, Plaintiff file with the court a current address or show cause why this case should not be dismissed for his failure to adequately prosecute this action. Doc. 21. This order specifically advised Plaintiff this case could not proceed if his whereabouts remained unknown and informed him that his failure to comply with its directives would result in the dismissal of this case. *Id.*

Plaintiff's copy of this order was returned to the court on October 21, 2019, marked as undeliverable.

The foregoing makes clear Plaintiff has failed to comply with the directives of the orders entered by this court and reflects a lack of interest in the continued prosecution of this case. This action cannot proceed properly in Plaintiff's absence. The court, therefore, concludes this case is due to be dismissed. *See Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (As a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failures to comply with the orders of this court and to prosecute this action.

It is

ORDERED that on or before **November 12, 2019**, the parties may file an objection to the Recommendation. A party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which the objection is made; frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file a written objection to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waives the right of the party to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of

plain error or manifest injustice. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done, this 28th day of October 2019.

/s/ Charles S. Coody
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE